

REMARKS

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Claims 1-9, 11-17, 19, 27-31, 33, 35-36, 38-46, 48-53, 55-56, 64-68, 70, 72-73, 75-76 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Karariya et al. ("Karariya", USPN 6,473,753) in view of Norihiko (JP 11-242545).

Katariya et al. (US 6,473,753 B1) discloses a weighting system for generating a weight for a term within one of a plurality of documents, the method comprising: generating a term frequency that represents a number of times that the term occurs in the one document; generating a total term frequency that represents a total number of times the term occurs in the plurality of documents; calculating a normalized term frequency by factoring the generated term frequency by a normalizing function of the generated total term frequency, wherein the normalizing function substantially equalizes result of term frequency and reciprocal total term frequency on the weight of the term; and combining the calculated normalized term frequency with a document frequency to generate the weight for the term.

It is respectfully submitted that Katariya et al. is not relevant to the present invention. For example, claim 38 recites detecting an occurrence of a transmitted or received message; extracting, dynamically, in response to the detection of an occurrence of a received message, a keyword from said received message; dynamically determining a degree of importance of said extracted keyword to update keywords associated with said apparatus and degrees of importance of the keywords stored in said memory such that which keywords are extracted and which keywords are determined to have a relatively high importance changes with time; and providing an indication of the occurrence of said extracted keyword within said received message in accordance with the determined degree of importance of said extracted keyword. Thus, the degrees of importance of the keywords are **dynamically** determined in a system in which the keywords which have a high importance change with time.

In Katariya et al., the weighting system first generates a term frequency that represents the number of times that the term occurs in the one document. The weighting system also may use various different algorithms for generating an improved term frequency that more accurately represents the importance of a term. The weighting system uses various factors, such as the formatting (e.g., italics) of a term and the number of unique terms within

the document, to generate the improved term frequency.

Dynamic decision making is generally defined as the process of assessing and **choosing among alternatives in the course of managing a system that changes over time**. That is, **an agent**, i.e., **not the user**, automatically makes choices based on predetermined criteria as the system changes.

It is respectfully submitted that Katariya et al. neither discloses nor suggests the detecting an occurrence of a transmitted or received message; extracting, dynamically, in response to the detection of an occurrence of a received message, a keyword from said received message; dynamically determining a degree of importance of said extracted keyword to update keywords associated with said apparatus and degrees of importance of the keywords stored in said memory such that which keywords are extracted and which keywords are determined to have a high importance changes with time; and providing an indication of the occurrence of said extracted keyword within said received message in accordance with the determined degree of importance of said extracted keyword, as recited in amended independent claim 38 and substantially claimed in claims 1 and 75.

Norihiko teaches a system wherein a keyword is manually entered by a user and any of three extractions may be implemented by user selection: (1) extraction using a free keyword (a list of speeches), i.e., from a speech designation button group; (2) extraction from a name-of-a-person group; and (3) extraction from an original speech (an utterance) group. This is not a **dynamic** determination, but rather is a **user-controlled** determination, i.e., is not agent-controlled in a dynamic fashion.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 38 and 75 are not taught or suggested by Katariya and/or Norihiko, alone or in combination, and thus are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Karariya et al. ("Karariya", USPN 6,473,753) in view of Norihiko (JP 11-242545).

In addition, since dependent claims 2-36, 39-73, 76-78 depend from amended independent claims 1, 38 and 75, respectively, dependent claims 2-36, 39-73, 76-78 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Karariya et al. ("Karariya", USPN 6,473,753) in view of Norihiko (JP 11-242545) for at least the reasons that amended independent claims 1, 38, and 75, respectively, are submitted to be allowable.

B. Claims 10, 18, 20-26, 32, 47, 54, 57-63, 69, 71 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Karariya et al. ("Karariya", USPN 6,473,753) in view of Norihiko (JP 11-242545) and further in view of Hideaki et al. ("Hideaki", JP 05-307569).

It is explained above why the amended independent claims of the present invention are submitted to be allowable 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katariya and/or Norihiko, alone or in combination.

Hideaki teaches that a keyword may be entered every day so that a user may obtain optimal information for the time period which the user demands, i.e., Hideaki separates the informational weight which is large with respect to desired information in a particular time range even though the information sought may be small, as for a notification of a festival which may occur only once a year (see paragraph 62). Thus, Hideaki does not teach or suggest, as is recited by claim 38, for example, of the present invention, detecting an occurrence of a transmitted or received message; extracting, dynamically, in response to the detection of an occurrence of a received message, a keyword from said received message; dynamically determining a degree of importance of said extracted keyword to update keywords associated with said apparatus and degrees of importance of the keywords stored in said memory such that which keywords are extracted and which keywords are determined to have a high importance changes with time; and providing an indication of the occurrence of said extracted keyword within said received message in accordance with the determined degree of importance of said extracted keyword.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 38, and 75 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Karariya et al. ("Karariya", USPN 6,473,753) in view of Norihiko (JP 11-242545) and further in view of Hideaki et al. ("Hideaki", JP 05-307569).

Since dependent claims 10, 18, 20-26, 32, 47, 54, 57-63, 69, 71 and 77 depend from amended independent claims 1, 38 and 75, respectively, dependent claims 10, 18, 20-26, 32, 47, 54, 57-63, 69, 71 and 77 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Karariya et al. ("Karariya", USPN 6,473,753) in view of Norihiko (JP 11-242545) and further in view of Hideaki et al. ("Hideaki", JP 05-307569) for at least the reasons that amended independent claims 1, 38 and 75 are allowable.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 2, 2004

By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501